Maalim Magazine
e-ISSN: 2600-6944 | p-ISSN: 2170-0052
Volume 18 Issue 2/ Décembre 2025 PP. 1-22

# Critical Review of Translation Quality Assessment Models: A New Taxonomy

**NADIR Abdelkader** *
Sc Institute of Translation – University of Algiers 2, Algeria, Department of Translation– Blida 2 University, Algeria
abdelkader.nadir@univ-alger2.dz

**DOI:10.33705/1111-018-002-020**

**Received: 15/09/2025**
**Accepted: 25/11/2025**
**Published: 28/12/2025**

***Corresponding Author**

Citation :
Saridaki, c. (2025).
Critical Review of Translation Quality Assessment Models: A New Taxonomy.
Maalim Magazine
I(2), 1-22



**Abstract:**

This paper presents a critical systematic review of Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) models and proposes a new taxonomy. The review tracks back the evolution of TQA and distinguishes it from Interpreting Quality Assessment (IQA). The review identifies various paradigms and approaches in TQA, highlighting the shift from prescriptive to functionalist models and the integration of educational assessment principles. The paper discusses the theoretical frameworks underpinning TQA models, including linguistic, functionalist, and sociocultural perspectives, and examines limitations of traditional models while introducing a new classification system for TQA models, which encompasses both academic and industry-based approaches.

**Keywords:** Translation Quality Assessment Models; Quality Evaluation; Educational Assessment; Taxonomy.

**Résumé:**

Cet article présente une revue systématique critique des modèles d'évaluation de la qualité de traduction (EQT) et propose une nouvelle taxonomie. La revue retrace l'évolution de la EQT et la distingue de l'évaluation de la qualité de l'interprétation (EQI). La revue identifie divers paradigmes et approches dans l'EQT, mettant en évidence le passage des modèles normatifs aux modèles fonctionnalistes et l'intégration des principes d'évaluation éducative. L' article discute des cadres théoriques qui sous-tendent les modèles d'EQT, y compris les perspectives linguistiques, fonctionnalistes et socioculturelles, et examine les limites des modèles traditionnels tout en introduisant un nouveau système de classification des modèles d'EQT, qui sont basés à la fois sur des approches académiques et industrielles.

**Mot clés :** Modèles d'évaluation de la qualité de traduction ; Evaluation de la qualité ; Évaluation éducative ; Taxonomie.

## مراجعة نقديّة لنماذج تقويم جودة التّرجمة التّحريريّة: اقتراح تصنيف جديد

**الملخّص:**

تقدم هذه الورقة البحثية مراجعة نقدية ممنهجة لنماذج تقويم جودة الترجمة (ت. ج. ت.) وتقترح تصنيفًا جديدًا. تصف المراجعة تطور (ت. ج. ت.) وتميزه عن تقويم جودة الترجمة الشفوية (ت. ج. ت. ش) ثم تحدد براديغمات ومقاربات مختلفة في (ت. ج. ت.)، مع تسليط الضوء على التحول من النماذج المعيارية إلى النماذج الوظيفية فضلا عن تبني مبادئ التقييم التربوي. تناقش الورقة الأطر النظرية التي تستند إليها نماذج (ت. ج. ت.) بما في ذلك المنظورات اللغوية والوظيفية والاجتماعية والثقافية، وتدرس حدود النماذج التقليدية مع اقتراح تصنيف جديد لهذه النماذج التي تشمل كل من النماذج المعتمدة على الأكاديميا والنماذج المعتمدة على الصناعة.

**الكلمات المفتاحيّة:** نماذج تقويم جودة الترجمة التحريرية؛ تقييم الجودة؛ التقويم التربوي؛ التصنيف.

**1. Introduction:** Analysis, selection and application of Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) models could be challenging in both Academia and Industry. To have a good idea about the state-of-the-art and avoid getting lost in the labyrinth of Translation and Interpreting research, this paper makes a step forward by digging out TQA frameworks and models through a succinct systematic qualitative review of literature, giving credit where credit is due. The purpose of TQA is clarified

(Academe, Industry), then models are differentiated from paradigms and theories. Limitations of previous taxonomies are stated. After that, a new taxonomy is introduced as Academe-based models versus Industry-based models. Its implications for future works by teachers, researchers and practitioners are emphasized where direction and guidance between academe and industry is going to be intrinsically reciprocal.

2. **Purpose of TQA:** As stated by Schäffner (1998), the main idea that one could start with is that the question of quality has always been on top of the issues in any discussion over translations as 'activities', as 'processes' or as 'products'. That is why she covered in her edited volume an interesting debate over the issue of translation quality assessment. All the papers of her book are reactions to Hönig's (1998) article which stressed the shift in TQA from contrastive linguistic approaches to functionalist approaches. In the words of Schäffner (1998, p. 2), instead of the traditional label 'good' translations, some scholars prefer to speak [now] of 'pragmatically adequate' or of 'functionally appropriate' translations. Hence, supporting this view, she tries to show the causes of this shift by asking the central question about the criteria that would determine a 'good' translation, compared to another 'bad' or 'poor' one, because It has always been said that the aim of each translation activity is to produce a good translation, i.e. a good target text (TT). As for her stance regarding this question, she assumes that there would definitely be controversy over the chosen assessment criteria, because these latter depend on the purpose of the assessment and on the theoretical framework applied by the assessors to give their 'subjective opinion' about the quality of the translation. Nowadays, practically speaking, the situation is more complex, either in academe or in the industry, because of the ubiquitous use of technology and the increasing number of criteria, norms and standards which are required to secure quality in the 'quality evaluation' (QE) process.

In this regard, first, according to the purpose of assessment, Campbell & Hale (2003, pp. 208-211) divide the literature on TQA into two broad categories: 'accreditation' and 'pedagogy'. However, they state explicitly that the purpose of the pedagogy area in translation is less clear cut. To clarify the distinction they have made, they have reviewed the works of many authors and have shown their different purposes. Namely, they have examined the studies of Brunette (2000), Dollerup (1994), Kussmaul (1995) and Sainz (1994) in addition to Farahzad (1992) and James and al. (1996).

Yet, apparently, all these authors are not well aware of educational assessment-related knowledge, because they do not seem to have a comprehensive conception of educational diagnostic, formative and summative forms of assessment. Instead, they suggest simple lists or charts of competencies reflecting some views on quality within a given framework such as the socio-communicative framework, the professional framework or the framework focused on target-language errors. All in all, to name just a few of these errors en passant, they can be classified into errors of spelling, punctuation, word knowledge, syntax, expression, connectors, lexical items, use of prepositions, style, register, accuracy, appropriation, etc. (see Dollerup, 1994 ; Sainz, 1994; Farahzad, 1992).

Nevertheless, Campbell and Hale (2003) do not mention that there are other purposes for the assessment of translations. For instance, Williams and Chesterman (2002) state that assessments of translations can be done in real life in several circumstances by trainers, examinators, critics, reviewers and overall by ordinary readers. Besides, some scholars and teachers contributed in the development of assessment methods neither for accreditation nor pedagogy. As we will see below, many scholars (e.g. Even-Zohar, 1990) deal with this issue just to examine translations' reception within target language (TL) society and culture in order to inform official language and culture planning in certain systems. Moreover, first attempts of translation assessment fall within literary criticism without particular interests in pedagogy. Furthermore, the term accreditation is confusing as it is misused. It is most of the time used with reference to translation agencies accreditation. That is why it would be better to use the term 'certification' when referring to individual translators and interpreters.

3. **Theoretical Frameworks of TQA:** As far as the theoretical frameworks and methodological considerations are concerned, since the development of TS in the seventies, a number of approaches have been used, many theories have been formulated and plenty of assessment models have been built. In this brief review, we will be content with an introductory panoramic picture which shows the big trends and ramifications without going deeper into discussing the findings of each of the tenets of these approaches, theories and models. This is a daunting task which deviates us from the track. We only intend here to show how the findings of translation studies became the ground upon which TQA models were built. Moreover, translation and interpreting are not totally

commensurable, because of their different natures as processes and as products. Hence, it would be difficult to project all the findings of TQA and IQA. Anyway, let us start first by taking a glance at the paradigms and approaches of TS, then move on to explore the theories that have led to the building of TQA models.

**4. Paradigms and Approaches:** The literature falls, at least, in four distinct broad paradigms: The prescriptive paradigm, the functionalist paradigm, the descriptive paradigm and the localization paradigm. These paradigms reflect boundaries between scholars' views regarding the possibility of reaching ST-TT equivalence and their contribution in the advancement of knowledge in TS. Snell-Hornby (2006)wonders whether each of the turns in TS (e.g. the linguistic turn in the 1970s, the cultural turn in the 1980s) is a groundbreaking paradigm or merely a shifting viewpoint. She investigates for example Venuti's (1995) foreignization paradigm, which is focused on very specific issues, such as the way of dealing with 'foreign' or exotic elements of literary texts and she confirms that all translation paradigms complement each other and are not at war. Pym (2004) wonders whether there is a shift to another new paradigm, that is the localization paradigm, especially with the increasing influence of globalization on the use of language and translation.

As for the approaches to TQA in TS, Tymoczko (2014) points out that the approaches that have left their mark are the linguistic approaches, the functionalist approaches, the systemic approaches, the cultural studies approaches, and more recently the internationalist approaches. This is due to in interdisciplinary research. For instance, there have been some cultural-literary approaches, some semiotics-cultural approaches (e.g. Torop, 2003) in addition to some philosophical (e.g. Ricoeur, 2004) and sociological approaches (e.g. Pym, 2004). Furthermore, the criticism which is stressed regarding these approaches is that they represent solely the western tradition in TS, that are attempts to re-explore the eastern traditions' underpinnings in order to lay a new foundation for TS and interpreting studies.

**5. Theories and Models:** As far as theories are concerned, on the one hand, Nida (1991) denies the existence of any full-scale theory and claims categorically that there is no possibility of formulating a general theory of translation. On the other hand, the other scholars who have attempted to make theories divide them according to their perspectives which range from philology

Maalim Magazine
Volume 18 Issue 2/ Décembre 2025

to technology. Hence, the assessors who have tried or who are still intending to build models could and might resort to a plethora of theories which show the broadness of the translation activity, namely philological theories, linguistic theories, Skopos theory of the Liepzig school (Reiss & Vermeer, 1984/2010), theory of translational action (Holz-Mänttäri, 1984), polysystem theory and system theory (Even-Zohar, 1978, 1990; Toury, 1995; Hermans, 1999) of manipulation school, psycholinguistic theory of scenes and frames (Dancette, 1992), discourse theories such as Speech Acts theory, Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1996), Argumentation theory in addition to philosophical theories. Consequently, undoubtly, they join Nida to stress the fact that there is no possibility to formulate a general theory of translation. Instead, in front of the more complex translation phenomena, these scholars formulated aspect-restricted theories influenced by their varying agendas. These theories have reflected the shift of TS from the prescription and functionalism to the more descriptive paradigm.

According to Munday (2008), Holmes (1972/2008) attempted, very early, to give some subdivisions to explain the limitation of any theory in translation studies, both the general theory of translation or the partial theories of translation, i.e. the more 'restricted' ones. Hence, he thinks that the translation theories might be restricted by medium, area, rank, text-type, time or problem. These theories, according to Munday, who quoted Holmes, are defined as follows:

• Medium-restricted theories subdivide according to translation by machine and humans, with further subdivisions according to whether the machine/computer is working alone or as an aid to the human translator, to whether the human translation is written or spoken [...]

• Area-restricted theories are restricted to specific languages or groups of languages and/or cultures. Holmes notes that language-restricted theories are closely related to work in contrastive linguistics and stylistics.

• Rank-restricted theories are linguistic theories that have been restricted to a specific level of (normally) the word or sentence. [...].

• Text-type restricted theories look at specific discourse types or genres; e.g. literary, business and technical translation. Text-type approaches came to prominence with the work of Reiss and Vermeer, amongst others, in the 1970s.

• Time-restricted theories: the term is self-explanatory, referring to theories and translations limited according to specific time frames and periods.

• Problem-restricted theories can refer to specific problems such as equivalence – a key issue of the 1960s and 1970s – or to a wider question of whether universals of translated language exist.

One could add more to these restrictions. For example, we may have theories that are restricted by the directionality in the pair of languages, i.e. by the SL or the TL. Also, we may have theories which are restricted by the level of the performance, for instance the theories of expert-level performance or of the novice-level of performance. This idea is supported by Neubert & Shreve (1992, p. 15) who see that "a theory of translation should explicate how the professional translator moves from the concrete source text, to the construction of the virtual translation, to the producing of the most appropriate text". By the term 'virtual translation' they mean the unfinished translation or 'the translation-in-progress'. By analogy, we may have a theory of translation which explicates how the novice learner moves from the ST to the TT and how he develops his skills.

Theorizing and modeling is sometimes ambiguous. Neubert & Shreve (1992, pp. 12-32) think that modeling translation is a process of analysis and selection which is determined by six research parameters: 1. The application domain (practice, pedagogy, criticism, automation), 2. The point of textual reference (source-centered, translation centered, target-centered), 3. The systemic focus (linguistic system, value system, knowledge system, text system, cognitive system, political system), 4. The object focus (source, translation, parallel text), 5. The activity focus (text comprehension, text production, text agency, cognition), 6. The research method (case study, experiment, text analysis, participant observation). Besides, without adopting any particular order and without naming who did what, they provide a very broad view of seven models of translation that are introduced with the following labels: the critical, the practical, the linguistic, the text-linguistic, the sociocultural, the computational and, finally, the psycholinguistic models. Neubert & Shreve believe that all these models are theoretical and applied at the same time. They have identified them with reference to the central concept of text in its three forms: ST, TT and Virtual Translation, which is the mental model of 'intermediary' translation. They have looked into how these models consider virtual translation in connection with textual meaning and its communicative value by addressing seven

Maalim Magazine
Volume 18 Issue 2/ Décembre 2025

parameters: intentionality, acceptability, situationality, informativity, coherence, cohesion and intertextuality.

However, Bell and Candlin (1991, pp. 23-26) distinguish between 'theories' and 'models' and see models as realizations of theories. For them, "the model exists as a tangible object (a diagram, a formula, a text) which stands for the idea embodied in a theory". Therefore, the models would be more useful in clarifying the criteria, the norms and the standards as components of quality and they are more practical in pedagogy as well, both for teaching and for assessment. Pöchhacker (2004, pp. 85-86) explains that modeling can be regarded as a particular form of theoretical endeavor by stating that: "A model can be described as some form of representation of an object or phenomenon. Models usually indicate the type and number of components which are assumed to form part of the object or phenomenon under study, and reflect the way in which the components fit together and relate to one another". He adds that a model is an assumption about what something is like and how it functions. Like Bell, he thinks that these theoretical models can take various forms of representation and expression: verbal description, imagery and mathematical formulas and graphic forms. Models, for him, are not used only for theorizing but also for describing, explaining and predicting a given phenomenon in a way that allows the testing of the model event though he claims that their predictive power in interpreting is weak.

Underneath, we suggest a different and more detailed taxonomy.

**6. A Taxonomy of TQA Models:** As a spin-off of this review, we believe that the TQA models could be classified into two types: Academe-based models and Industry-based models. These two types include different categories and sub-categories as we will see below.

**6.1. Academe-based Models:** This type includes two categories. The first category encompasses the non-didactic models, that is the prescription-oriented, the function-oriented, the description-oriented and the explanation-oriented models. The second category includes all the didactics-oriented models. We prefer not to use the label 'theoretical', because we agree with Neubert & Shreve (1992) that all these models are theoretical and applied at the mean time. Even the industry-based models are based on theory such as Williams' (2001) model.

In the first category, the pioneering linguistic models were mainly prescriptive, because they were concerned with the types of translation and how equivalent translation should be achieved. Panou (2013) summarized the findings of these models in addition to the findings of House (1997) , Baker (1992)and Pym (2010) showing how some of them explored theoretically the concept of equivalence in relation to the different types of translation which they could identify. We will introduce the first linguistic models and deal later with the models of the three latter as they are, elsewhere, classified among the discourse-oriented models which make use of Hallidayan linguistics to examine translation as communication within a sociocultural context.

For instance, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1972) think that there are two types of translation: Direct, i.e. literal translation and Oblique, i.e. free translation. For them, equivalence is just a procedure needed mainly in the second type. In fact, they have given seven procedures of translation three of which are covered by direct translation: Borrowing, calque and literal translation. The other procedures are: Transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation. These scholars believe that these strategies operate on three macro-levels: the lexicon, the syntactic structure and the message. They also operate on two micro-levels: word order and thematic structure in addition to connectors (Munday, 2008). Jacobson (1959) suggested three types of translation which are respectively intralingual translation or 'rewording', interlingual translation or 'translation proper' and intersemiotic translation or 'transmutaion'. Besides, he does not see the possibility of achieving equivalence even between two words. Nida (1964, pp. 159-160) distinguishes between 'gloss translation' and 'dynamic translation'. He introduced the distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content, i.e. the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. Thus, standards of accuracy and correctness are determined by comparing the message in the receptor culture with the message in the source culture. Whereas, dynamic equivalence, or functional equivalence (Munday, 2008), focuses on complete naturalness, i.e. it is based on the principle of equivalent effect whereby the relationship between the receptor of the translated text and the message should meet the relationship between the reader of the original and the message. Catford (1965) was credited for his distinction between full and partial translation, between total and restricted translation, and finally between rank-bound translation and unbound translation. For him, equivalence occurs according to two types of shifts: level shifts, for example, grammar-lexis, and category shifts such as structure, unit, class and intra-system shifts. Koller did not identify any types of translation but said that equivalence can be denotative 'for content', connotative 'for lexis', text-normative 'for text type', pragmatic 'i.e. receiver-focused' and formal 'for text form and aesthetics' (see Munday, 2008, p. 47). He believes that 'correspondence' involves the comparison of two language systems described contrastively, whereas equivalence deals with equivalent items in specific ST-TT pairs and contexts. Newmark (1981, 1988, 1991) distinguishes between semantic and communicative translation. The first focuses on meaning but the second on effect, it is reader-oriented so it looks for his needs. According to him, equivalence is better achieved through literal translation in both types.

These debates about translation types are linked to the debate about the taxonomies of text typology, because it has been the main research issue for a long time in translation assessment: Delisle (1980), Newmark (1981, 1988, 1991), Snell-Hornby (1988), Snell and Crampton (1983) and Sager (1983) (see Roberts, 1988). All of them expressed the need to set these taxonomies of texts and translations to inform TQA, but there is hitherto no complete taxonomy. Roberts (1988, pp. 69-78) analyzed the foregoing taxonomies and classified them into TS taxonomies 'Delisle; Newmark; Snell-Hornby' (ST-oriented) and translation profession taxonomies 'Snell & Cramton; Sager' (TT-oriented). She then tried to provide a more complete taxonomy with professional and non-professional specifications which include ST and TT dimensions (such as purpose, function, specialization, discourse style, register, etc) in addition to the translation approach (e.g. the translator's focus; the degree of modification of the TT) as a third dimension.

According to the literature we have reviewed, all the previous models, in plural, are sometimes referred to as 'the traditional linguistic model', in singular (Neubert & Shreve, 1992, pp. 19-22). They were intended to establish the criteria for a 'good translation' (Waddington, 2001: 311). For instance, Nida (1964, pp. 182-184) thinks that three fundamental criteria are basic to the evaluation of all translating, and in different ways help to determine the relative merit of particular translations. These are: (1) general efficiency of the communication process, (2) comprehension of intent, and (3) equivalence of response. Nevertheless, these models were seen to be simplistic and paved the way for new models that take into account other dimensions.

Amongst the most full-fledged and recognized scholarly functionalist models of TQA, one may cite chronologically: Reiss's (2000) Translation Criticism model, House's (1977, 1997) Translation Quality Assessment model and Peeter Torop's (2000) Semiotics-related model.

These models are based on applied linguistics, because they, basically, approached translation from the perspectives of text linguistics, discourse analysis linguistics and semiotics. Some of them adopted interdisciplinary perspectives. Anyway, Hönig (1998, pp. 7-8) believes that Reiss's model (1971) was a pioneering endeavor as she was the first to introduce 'text typology' in the assessment based on contrastive linguistics. The traditional contrastive approach did not extend the comparison between the ST and TT farther than the lexical and syntactic units, but she based her 'contrastive' approach on text-types according to the notion of dominance, that is to say dominance of content over form or the opposite. She distinguishes three types of texts which are: (1) 'content-focused texts' (inhaltsbetonter Texttyp) such as news items, business correspondence and official documents or manuals, (2) 'form-focused texts' (formbetonter Texttyp) which include literary genres such as novels, plays and poetry, and (3) 'appeal-focused texts' (appellbetonter Texttyp) such as advertising, satirical prose, pamphlets and election speeches. In addition, as a premise to 'functionalism' even though not stated and embraced as a new approach, she adopted the principle of keeping the type of the ST, i.e producing a TT tantamount in function to the ST. It is significant that she did not base her semantic analyses on traditional models but applied the so-called organon model of the Austrian psychologist Karl Bühler to translating. According to the latter, the linguistic sign has three basic functions: The representational function, i.e. the linguistic sign is a symbol of extralinguistic reality, the expressive function, because it is a symptom of the sender's attitude toward the described reality and the appellative function, because it is a signal which stimulates responses from the recipient.

According to Hönig (1998, p. 9) , this model was further developed by Vermeer through his Skopos theory. The term 'Skopos' means 'purpose'. Vermeer's book 'A general framework theory of Translation' marked the beginning of functionalism as a distinct approach by considering translations as 'acts' (Handlungen) and thus placing it in the context of sociolinguistic pragmatics.

Vermeer believes that texts are produced for defined recipients to fulfill a particular purpose. In short, two key words explain his approach, the first is 'information offered' (Informationsangebot), which means that the ST should no longer be seen as the 'sacred original', and the second is 'purpose' (Skopos) which means that the purpose of the successful translation can no longer be deduced from the ST but depends on the expectations, needs and culture of the TT readers, because they are the recipients and assessors of the 'product' in different 'situations'.

Progressively, House's model (1997) which is built upon discourse theories took into consideration some textual, situational and cultural aspects in the analysis in order to exploit the findings of research in Linguistics and its sub-fields, or applied ones, such as Text Linguistics, Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics. The contribution of the field in TQA is well depicted by Schäffner (1998: 2) who says that text linguistic and pragmatic approaches to TQA increased awareness of the fact that the linguistic format of the TT is above all determined by the text-typological conventions of the TL, as well as by aspects of the communicative situation in the target culture in which the TT is to fulfil its function (e.g. time and place, knowledge and expectations of the TT addressees), and not primarily by the linguistic structures of the ST. House sees the function of a text as the application or use which the text has in the particular context of a situation. A translation text should not only match its source text in function, but employ equivalent situational-dimensional means to achieve that function. According to House (2006, p. 29), the model is primarily based on the Hallidayan systemic-functional theory (Halliday, 1994), but it also relates to Prague functional stylistics, speech act theory and discourse analysis. Consequently, for her (2006, p. 28) , translation is considered as "a cross-linguistic cultural practice involving recontextualisation".

Her model is well described in the following diagram, which includes three sociolinguistic dimensions of the context of situation jointly characterizing a particular register: field, tenor and mode. Field captures the subject matter or topic. Tenor refers to the nature of participants, the author and his or her addressees, to the relationship between them in terms of social power and familiarity in addition to the author's intellectual and affective stance, i.e his personal viewpoint. Mode refers to the use of the channel or medium of communication in speech and writing. House adds the notion of genre to her scheme to analyze how the text functions pragmatically as discourse. While register refers to a segment or variety of language in use in certain contexts, genre is seen as a kind of discourse defined by its communicative function in the linguistic-cultural community at large (House, 2009: 34-35; 115-119).

Torop's (2003) Semiotics-related model is less used in training, because its language is less accessible to trainees who are not acquainted with Semiotics theories. He focuses on the relationship between translation and culture in terms of their complex interrelated semiotic signs and systems. This work is less cited in training manuals.

In addition to Semiotics, Firthian and Hallidayan influence of discourse analysis and systemic functional grammar, which views language as a communicative act in a sociocultural context, has been prominent over past decades, especially in Australia and the UK. It has been applied to translation in a series of works by scholars such as Bell and Candlin (1991), Baker (1992) , Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997) and even Pym (2010) . However, their findings are not seen as complete independent models or, the least that can be said is that they are less influential models à l'instar de Torop's Model. These sociocultural models were implemented to some extent in the academic training of translators, but they were not concerned with the didactic translation assessment per se. Nevertheless, they have led to the birth of models which belong to the second category.

In the second category, there are many didactics-oriented models which were recognized as such. On top of them, we find Nord's (1997) Translation Evaluation Model**,** which is equal to House's model in importance. It is considered as the pioneering didactic model as it is concerned with trainees' performance assessment (Hatim & Mason, 1997). It is based on a text-linguistic approach and it gained support among the scholars as a reference model for translation assessment with its prevailing concepts of text analysis such as word order, information structure and thematic progression.

In addition, other didactics-oriented models have been introduced by adding more categories or parameters in the analysis in order to implement evaluation procedures in translation curricula. They were devised either by individual researchers or by research groups. The individual models were introduced by Hatim & Mason (1990), Baker (1992), Deslise (1993), Kussmaul (1995), Lauscher (2000), Brunette (2000) , Bowker (2000), Waddington (2003), Al-Qinaï (2000) , Jimenez

Crespo (2011) . These models focused on translation types and error analysis. So, each scholar suggested his own list of assessed errors. The two models introduced by the research groups are: The PACTE's (1993-2014) Translation Competence Model and the EMT Model (2014). These expert groups are formed by researchers as well as by professionals, so their models combine research findings and the professional know-how.

The first model which merits mentioning, as it is concerned with Translation Didactics and Pedagogy, is The PACTE GROUP's Translation Competence Model. This is the result of experimental research of a Spanish research group. It sees the translation competence as the sum of five competencies that must be developed in the learning process and should be reflected in the product (PACTE Group, 2009). The second model is EMT Model (2009-2014) which defines 'competence' as "the combination of aptitudes, knowledge, behaviour and knowhow necessary to carry out a given task under given conditions. This combination is recognised and legitimised by a responsible authority (institution, expert)." This group of experts identified 6 different competences which can be applied to translation as well as to the different modes of interpreting. These are Translation Service Provision Competence, Language Competence, Data Mining Competence, Intercultural Competence, Thematic Competence and Technological Competence (EMT Expert Group, 2009).

From the educational assessment perspective, one has to cite some invaluable studies which complement these didactic models by relating research in assessment to research in translation. For instance, in Angelelli and Jacobson's (2009) edited volume of papers, they have classified the papers into three parts. The first one is devoted to the developments of assessment instruments such as rubrics. Nevertheless, they dealt with their theoretical applications in TQA only and not in IQA. In the second part, the other contributors present the various empirical approaches. In the third part, the authors deal with assessment matters in interpreting.

In the co-authored introduction, Angelelli and Jacobson (2009: 1-10) go back to the first theoretical frameworks and a wide range of models on translation equivalence to justify the importance of the concept of quality in translation and interpreting studies; namely, Nida's (1964) concepts of formal and dynamic equivalence, Newmark's (1982) dichotomous semantic and communicative translation, Toury's (1995) framework based on adequacy and acceptability, Venuti's (1995) coined terms foreignization and domestication, Bastin's (1998) pragmatic adaptation, Reiss & Vermeer's (1984) Skopos Theory in addition to the models of Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997). Hickey (1998) and Baker (1992) turned to disciplines such as theoretical linguistics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis to inform models of translation and description of translation quality. Nonetheless, they state clearly that House (1981, 1997, 1998) was the first scholar to focus specifically on translation quality assessment.

All the papers of this volume are instructive, but Angelelli's contribution is more relevant as it sheds light on the use of rubrics. By referring to the literature on translation studies, testing and SLA, she focuses on the importance of using a rubric to assess translation ability. She explains that the examiner must answer some questions before making decisions on test specifications. All in all, he must consider the nature of the test, a norm-referenced or a criterion-referenced one, its reliability and validity, that is to say ensuring that the measurement is consistent and that it tests what the test is meant to measure, and finally, make sure that the test and the task is authentic.

As regards the reliability of TQA, the main issue is intersubjective reliability. Shäffner (1998) points out that quality depends on the assessment criteria of the text user and not on 'objective criteria' shared by any assessor in different contexts. This idea is reflected in the works of House (1997) who say that different concepts of translational quality go hand in hand with different ways of assessing it, Pöchhacker (1994) who identifies various people who can assess the quality of a TT in interpreting and Hönig who say that different assessment scenarios apply to written translation as well. The major problem in this context is intersubjective reliability, because with each assessor having a specific aim, depending on the factors of the assessment context, and applying different assessment criteria, the agreement between the assessors is impossible. Therefore, as regards TQA from an educational perspective, particularly the question of marking and scoring, as Hönig shows, even within one scenario, i.e. the teaching context, agreement is not easily achieved. A common practice in assessing translations that are produced in language courses is to count linguistic errors, deduct points for each error and/or add bonus points for good solutions, for 'flashes of insight'. Such marking practice, which is often no more than vocabulary testing, usually measures the TT quality against some 'model translation'. In contrast to this, Hönig makes a difference between diagnosis and therapy. A solid translation assessment or criticism should diagnose which effect a translated text would have in its environment for its addressees. He argues that such a functionally based assessment of translation mistakes should also be applied in a therapeutic sense in the training of professional translators.

Additionally, Inès (2009: 129-149), with reference to the Bologna process which promotes competence-based learning, suggests an 'alternative form of assessing translators' which is based on evaluating students' use of electronic corpora. She proposes the incorporation of 'learning corpus use' in the training program as a learning objective via a student-centered and task-based methodology to develop translation competence, which is defined according to her as the result of "interaction between knowledge, skills and attitudes for the purpose of carrying out a task in an appropriate way". Thus, learning objectives, for her, are considered as a guide for teaching and as a reference for evaluation purposes, because these objectives are related to the sub-competences that form the translation competence. Corpora use is related to the instrumental sub-competence. Therefore, as regards evaluation, she focused on the evaluation of the process and not the overall quality of the product. She relies on the PACTE's Model of Translation Competence (2003) and the following instruments: Teacher's observation chart to record students' observable progress; Student's learning diary to keep a record of their learning; self-evaluation questionnaire for students to assess their own learning [...]; feedback questionnaire for students to comment on unit contents and methodology.

**6.2. Industry-based Models:** With reference to the professional context, alternative models include additional industry-based parameters. For instance, Gouadec (1981), Williams (2001, 2004), Pym (2004) and O'brien (2012) have dealt with these models and have even described their own ones.

Gouadec (1981: 99-116, 1989) recalls that the traditional categories of errors (contresens, non-sens, faux-sens, barbarisme, etc) and the binary labels 'minor' and 'major' lead the companies to merely vague and broad evaluations which depend on the subjectivity of the evaluator. Thus, he considers that these categories and labels fit for 'review' and not for 'evaluation'. According to him, any evaluation system should fill two functions: an explanation and a ponderation function. These functions are interrelated with the pedagogic, the professional and the research necessities. He clarifies that the evaluation parameters must not be confused with the translation parameters. He suggests two types of parameters: lexical and syntaxic. Besides, he clarified the considerations to be taken into account while evaluating on the basis of these parameters. Then, he provided his own view.

Williams (2001, 2004) suggests Argumentation-based Translation Assessment model based on the theory of argumentation. He divides preceeding Translation quality assessment (TQA) models into two main types: (1) Quantitative models, such as SEPT (1979) and SICAL (1986), and (2) Non-quantitative models, such as the aforementioned text-discourse models, namely Nord (1991) and House (1997). He thinks that these two types suffer from shortcomings. He draws on the works of Bensoussan and Rosenhouse (1990) and Larose (1998). For him, Type 1 tends to focus on microtextual (sampling, subsentence) analysis and error counts. He identified the following shortcomings: First, because of time constraints, it cannot assess, except on the basis of statistical probabilities, the acceptability of the content of the translation as a whole. Second, the microtextual analysis inevitably hinders any serious assessment of the content macrostructure of the translation. Third, the establishment of an acceptability threshold based on a specific number of errors is vulnerable to criticism both theoretically and in the marketplace. He thinks that Type 2 cannot offer a cogent acceptability threshold either, precisely because it does not propose error weighting and quantification for individual texts.

According to Pym (2004), the recent debates in translation studies are focused on the developments which occurred as a consequence to the phenomenon known as globalisation. They are referred to as (GILT). This term stands for 'Globalisation, Internationalisation, Localisation and Translation', which means that translation is in the interplay of a complex phenomenon where there are different processes. Grosso Modo, Internationalisation means that the translation is culture-free and directed to the world citizen; whereas, localization is the process through which the translation is colored with the local culture of the receptor of the translation. So, the assessment focuses on the degree of internationalization or localization of the products, whatever their nature is.

With the increase of machine translation usage in the professional sphere, and the dissatisfaction about the translated products, Obrien's (2012) Dynamic Quality Model for Translation was suggested as an alternative to the existing industrial-based models QE models. In collaboration with the TAUS, She conducted a project which asked the member companies to benchmark 11 QE models using different parameters such as utility, time and sentiment. She considered that the gatekeepers in the industry are still using static, normative and time consuming models of Quality Evaluation (QE) which do not take into account input from the customers. Her model addresses four challenges First, the budgetary constraints, because the current industry-based QE models are time-consuming and costly. Second, the new paradigm which considers all the new meanings of the term 'text'. Third, the new technology, in particular machine translation. Finally, the new focus on the perception of the user, because the use of Web 2 gives more control to the user over the services and the products. Her model is presented as a response to the failure of the error-counting method to ensure quality in the new situations of communication where there are new types of content such as tweets, blog postings, multi-media and user-generated content. Her study revealed that there are two categories. The first category includes 10 models, because they focus on errors in the product. In the second category, there is one standard which is EN15038 standard the purpose of which is to "establish and define the requirements for the provision of quality services by translation service providers" (Comité Européen de Normalisation).

**Conclusion:** TQA is different from IQA. We focused not only on assessment in educational contexts, i.e. on criticism and pedagogical assessment but also on professional certification of translators. We delved into the methodological considerations and the different available models to pave the way for introducing the new taxonomy that will be beneficial in simplification of complex knowledge, conceptual reorganization of current findings and models' adoption and application. It is worth noting that our attempt is limited to the studies published or available in three languages only, these are English, French and Arabic. Therefore, opportunities for future research are ahead by covering other languages such as Spanish, German and Chinese in addition to Russian and Japanese. Findings of many interesting studies and new academe-industry perspectives in terms of criteria selection and model building, training and certification in addition to professionalization could be revealed.

## References:

1) AL-QINAI, J. (2000). Translation Quality Assessment. Strategies, Parametres and Procedures. Meta, 45(3), 497–519. doi: https://doi.org/10.7202/001878ar

2) ANGELELLI, C. V., & JACOBSON, H. E. (2009). Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies: A call for dialogue between research and practice. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

3) BAKER, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London and New York: Routledge.

4) BELL, R. T., & CANDLIN, C. (1991). Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice. (Coll. Applied Linguistics and Language Study ed.). Londres/New York: Longman.

5) BENSOUSSAN, M., & ROSENHOUSE, J. (1990). Evaluating Student Translations By Discourse Analysis. Babel 36:2, 36(2), 65-84. doi:10.1075/babel.36.2.02ben

6) BOWKER, L. (2000). A Corpus-Based Approach to Evaluating Student Translations. Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication, 6(2), 183-210. doi:10.1080/13556509.2000.10799065

7) BRUNETTE, L. (2000). Towards a Terminology for Translation Quality Assessment: A Comparison of TQA Practices. Translator: Special Issue on Evaluation and Translation, 6(2), 169-182. doi:10.1080/13556509.2000.10799064

8) CAMPBELL, S., & HALE, S. (2003). Translation and Interpreting Assessment in the Context of Educational Measurement. In G. ANDERMAN , & M. ROGERS, Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

9) CATFORD, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics (1 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

10) DANCETTE, J. (1992, Septembre). Modèles sémantique et propositionnel de l’analyse de la fidélité en traduction. Meta: Journal des traducteurs/Translators' Journal, 37(3), 440-449. doi:DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/002450ar

11) DELISLE, J. (1980). L' analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction (éd. 1). Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa.

12) DOLLERUP, C. (1994). Systematic Feedback in Teaching Translation. . In C. DOLLERUP, & A. LINDEGAARD, Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2: Insights, Aims, Vision. Papers from the Second Language International Conference Elsinore, Denmark 4 - 6 June 1993 (pp. 121-132). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

13) EMT Expert Group. (2009). Competences for professional translators, experts in multilingual and multimedia communication. Retrieved 11 4, 2025, from
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/key_documents/emt_competences_translators_en.pdf

14) EVEN-ZOHAR, I. (1978). The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem: New Perspectives in Literary Studies. In J. S. HOLMES, J. LAMBERT, & R. VAN DEN BROECK, Literature and Translation (pp. 117–127). Leuven: Acco.

Maalim Magazine
Volume 18 Issue 2/ Décembre 2025
15) EVEN-ZOHAR, I. (1990, Spring). Polysystem Studies. Poetics Today: Polysystem Studies. International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication, 11(1), 1-268.

16) FARAHZAD, F. (1992). Testing Achievement in Translation Classes. In C. DOLLERUP, & A. LODDEGAARD, Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent, Experience. Papers from the First Language International Conference, Elsinore, Denmark, 31 May-2 June 1991 (pp. 271-278). Amsterdan/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/z.56.41far

17) GOUADEC, D. (1981). Paramètres de l'évaluation des traductions. Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal, 26(2), 99-116. doi:https://doi.org/10.7202/002949ar

18) HALLIDAY, M. K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Beijing and London: Foreign Language Teaching and Researching Press; Edward Arnold (Publishers) Limited.

19) HATIM, B., & MASON, I. (1990). Discourse and the Translator. London: Longman.

20) HATIM, B., & MASON, I. (1997). The Translator as Communicator. NY & London: Routledge.

21) HERMANS, T. (1999). Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained (1 ed.). Manchester: St Jerome Publishing. doi:https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315760469

22) HOLMES, J. S. (1972/2008). The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In J. MUNDAY, Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application (2 ed., pp. 9—11). London & NY: Routledge.

23) HOLZ-MANTTARI, J. (1984). Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode (Translational Action: Theory and Method ed.). Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

24) HÖNIG, H. (1998). Positions, Power and Practice: Functionalist Approaches and Translation Quality. In C. SCHÄFFNER, Translation and Quality (pp. 6-34). Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto, Sydney, Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

25) HOUSE, J. (1977). A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

26) HOUSE, J. (1997). Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited. Tübingen: Narr.

27) HOUSE, J. (2006). Covert Translation, Language Contact, Variation and Change. SYNAPS, 19, 25-47.

28) INES, P. R. (2009). Evaluating the process and not just the product when using corpora in translator education. In A. BEEBY, P. INES, & P. SANCHEZ-GIJON, Corpus Use and Translating : Corpus Use for Learning to Translate and Learning Corpus Use to Translate (Benjamins Translation Library ed.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

29) JAKOBSON, R. (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In R. A. BROWER, On Translation (pp. 232-239). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

30) JIMENEZ-CRESPO, M. A. (2011). From Many One: Novel Approaches to Translation Quality in a Social Network Era. Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series, 10.

31) KUSSMAUL, P. (1995). Training the Translator (Benjamins Translation Library ed., Vol. 10). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

32) LAROSE, R. (1998). Méthodologie de l'évaluation des traductions. Meta : journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal, 43(2), 163-186. doi:10.7202/003410ar

33) LAUSCHER, S. (2000). Translation Quality Assessment: Where can Theory and Practice Meet? The Translator, 6(2), 149-168 . doi:10.1080/13556509.2000.10799063

34) MUNDAY, J. (2008). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. London & NY: Routledge.

35) NEUBERT, A., & SHREVE, G. M. (1992). Translation as Text (Tanslation Studies Series ed., Vol. 1). Kent: Kent State University Press.

36) NEWMARK, P. (1981). Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon.

37) NEWMARK, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York and London: Prentice Hall.

38) NEWMARK, P. (1991). About Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

39) NIDA, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill. Retrieved 12 9, 2014, from http://www.bible-researcher.com/nida1.html

40) NIDA, E. A. (1991). Theories of Translation. TTR : traduction, terminologie, rédaction, 4(1), 19-32. Retrieved from http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/037079ar

41) NORD, C. (1997). Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained. Manchester: St. Jerome.

42) O'BRIEN, S. (2012, January). Towards a Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model for Translation. The Journal of Specialised Translation, 17(A), 55-77. doi:10.26034/cm.jostrans.2012.459

43) PACTE Group. (2009). Results Of The Validation Of The Pacte Translation Competence Model: Acceptability And Decision Making. Across Languages and Cultures, 10(2), 207–230. doi:10.1556/Acr.10.2009.2.3

44) PANOU, D. (2013, January). Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3(1), 1-6. doi:10.4304/tpls.3.1.1-6

45) PÖCHHACKER, F. (2004). Introducing Interpreting Studies. London and New York: Routledge.

46) PYM, A. (2004). The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution (Benjamins Translation Library ed., Vol. 49). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

47) PYM, A. (2010). Exploring Translation Theories (1 ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

48) REISS, K. (2000). Translation Criticism – The Potentials & Limitations: Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment. (E. F. RHODES, Trans.) Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

49) REISS, K., & VERMEER, H. J. (1984/2010). Grubdlegung einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie. [Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation] . Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag/De Gruyter Brill. doi:https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111351919

50) RICOEUR , P. (2004). Sur la traduction. Paris: Bayard.

51) ROBERTS, R. P. (1988). Towards a Typology of Translation. HIERONYMUS(1). Retrieved 1 1, 2014, from http://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/hieronymus/pdf/01/01_069.pdf

52) SAGER, J. C. (1983). Quality and Standards. The Evaluation of Translations. In C. PICKEN, The Translator's Handbook (1 ed., pp. 121-128). London: Aslib and contributors.

53) SAINZ, M. J. (1994). Student-centred Correction of Translations. In C. DOLLERUP, & A. LINDEGAARD, Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2: Insights, Aims, Vision. Papers from the Second Language International Conference Elsinore, Denmark 4 - 6 June 1993 (pp. 133-141). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

54) SCHÄFFNER, C. (1998). Translation and Quality (Vol. Current Issues in Language and Society). (P. C.-H. Dennis Ager, Ed.) Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto, Sydney, Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

55) SNELL, B., & CRAMPTON, P. (1983). Types of Translations. In C. PICKEN, The Translator's Handbook (1 ed., pp. 109-120). London: Aslib and contributors.

56) SNELL-HORNBY, M. (1988). Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/z.38

57) SNELL-HORNBY, M. (2006). The Turns of Translation Studies. John Benjamins.

58) SPERBER, D., & WILSON, D. (1996). Relevance: Communication and Cognition (2 ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

59) TOROP, P. (2000). Towards the Semiotics of Translation. Semiotica, 128,(3/4), 597-609.

60) TOROP, P. (2003). Intersemiosis and Intersemiotic Translation. In S. PETRILLI , Translation Translation (pp. 271-282). Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

61) TOURY, G. (1995). Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (Benjamins Translation Library ed., Vol. 4). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

62) TYMOCZKO, M. (2014). Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators (1 ed.). London: Routledge. doi:https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315759494

63) VINAY, J. P., & DARBELNET, J. (1958/1972). Stylistique Comparée du Francais et de l' Anglais: Méthode de Traduction (2 ed.). Paris: Marcel Didier. Retrieved 9 15, 2025, from https://archive.org/details/VinayDarbelnetStylistiqueCompareDuFranaisEtDeLanglais/page/n7/mode/2up

64) WADDINGTON, C. (2003). A Positive Approach to the Assessment of Translation Errors. In R. MUÑOZ MARTÍN , AIETI. Actas del I Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación. Granada 12-14 February 2003 (AIETI ed., Vol. 2, pp. 409-426). Granada. Retrieved from http://www.aieti.eu/pubs/actas/I/AIETI_1_CW_Approach.pdf

65) WILLIAM, J., & CHESTERMAN, A. (2002). A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies. London, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.

66) WILLIAMS, M. (2001). The Application of Argumentation Theory to Translation Quality Assessment. Meta: Journal des traducteurs/Translators' Journal, 46(2), 326-344. . doi:10.7202/004605ar